

Q.
303, 28043
am A-14

Current Awareness of and Opinions Concerning
the Mutual Aerial Inspection Plan

Report No. A-14
Series No. 3
August 26, 1957

UNCLASSIFIED

RESEARCH STAFF

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE
AMERICAN EMBASSY, GERMANY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
INTRODUCTION	i
SUMMARY	ii
Part I - Knowledge of the Plan	1 - 5
Part II - Evaluation of the Plan	6 - 20
Section 1 - Approval of the Plan	6 - 7
Section 2 - Expectations Regarding the Plan	7 - 9
Section 3 - Implementation	9 - 20
Part III - Views Regarding International Disarmament	21 - 24
Part IV - The Role of Information Media	25 - 37
Section 1 - Non-USIS Exposure and Knowledge of the Plan	25 - 29
Section 2 - USIS Media Exposure and Knowledge of the Plan	29 - 32
Section 3 - The Relationship between USIS and non- USIS Exposure and Knowledge of the Plan	32 - 35
Section 4 - Extent of USIS Exposure	35 - 37

INTRODUCTION

At the Summit Conference of the Four Powers in Geneva during July 1955, President Eisenhower first proposed that a Mutual Aerial Inspection Plan be instituted between the USSR and the U.S. as a means of alleviating suspicion, decreasing armaments, and thus promoting peace throughout the world.

July 1957 was deemed an appropriate time point to survey the West German population again on the extent of their knowledge of the Plan as well as their reactions to it. The time was fortuitous since it was exactly two years since the Plan was first proposed - and because it has been just over one year that USIS, Bonn, made furtherance of knowledge of the idea an integral part of its objectives.

Inasmuch as an initial survey to determine the level of West German knowledge on the subject was carried out in February 1956, the results of the present survey were to be taken as a measure of the effectiveness of the efforts made to spread knowledge and understanding of the Mutual Inspection Plan.

The survey itself was conducted between June 28 and July 13, 1957. The findings are based upon a 1907 case probability sample, representative of the West German population 18 years of age and over. Interviewing was conducted by DIVO, Marktforschung - Meinungsforschung - Sozialforschung, Frankfurt am Main - Bad Godesberg, a German survey organization working under contract with the Research Staff.

SUMMARY

Two years after the introduction of the idea of a Mutual Aerial Inspection between the USSR and the USA, knowledge of the existence of the Plan among the West German population is only to be found in one person out of three - the same level which existed in February 1956, the last time a survey on the subject was held. Although there is no gain in knowledge in the population that President Eisenhower is the author of the Plan, there is greater understanding of its details (among those who have heard of it) than was true in the past.

Approval of the Plan was found to be considerably higher in the current survey. Even among those who had to be told about it, three out of four approved of it. Two other favorable reactions to the Plan were found. The Plan is now thought to have a 50-50 chance of being adopted (with Russia still getting the blame if it is not); and a majority now feels that it would contribute to world peace. On the other hand, only a minority sees the Plan as equally advantageous to both the East and the West (representing no change from opinion as of a year ago).

While, as before, few think that the Soviets have any real interest in disarmament, twice as many as before now say that the U.S. has great interest.

It was found that those people who have high indices of exposure to Media of communication (non-USIS) are more likely to know of the Plan (than those who have not) but those who expose themselves to USIS Media have even more knowledge. Unfortunately, most people exposed to some USIS activity were unable to remember the specific USIS occasion through which they might have learned of the Plan. Thus the definite proof that their greater knowledge came directly from attendance is lacking. Through further analysis, however, it was determined that the average USIS exposed person has much more general Media exposure (from which he could also have learned). Still, when the level of outside exposure is controlled, USIS people are found to have even greater awareness than non-USIS exposed individuals with the same index of general Media exposure.

There is evidence that the Information Programs channels among the West German population are drying up. There is a definite decrease in the percentage of the adult population listening to the Voice of America, and indications that the percentages taking part in other USIS activities is on the decline.

I. Knowledge of the Plan

AWARENESS OF PLAN BARELY HIGHER AFTER ONE AND ONE-HALF YEARS ...

The percentage of the West German population having heard of the Mutual Inspection Plan in July 1957, exactly two years after it was proposed, can hardly be considered higher than the percentage aware of it in February 1956. The present survey results show 37%, as against 33% earlier, saying that they had heard of the Plan.

"Have you ever heard of the plan for mutual aerial inspection which was suggested at the last Four-Power conference of the heads of state in Geneva?"

	<u>West Germany</u>	
	Feb 1956 (1801)	July 1957 (1907)
Yes, heard of it	33%	37%
No, haven't heard of it	67	63
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Those who had heard of the Plan were asked several other questions to check further on the extent and accuracy of their knowledge concerning the Mutual Inspection Plan. Among the most significant of these probes were the questions asking these individuals who had suggested the Plan, and what the Plan is about.

NO GAIN IN KNOWLEDGE OF EISENHOWER AS AUTHOR, BUT INCREASED UNDERSTANDING OF THE PLAN ITSELF ...

The proportion of individuals who know that Eisenhower proposed the Mutual Inspection Plan is about the same now as last year - namely one out of ten. However, since a slightly higher percentage now claims to have heard of the Plan (37% against 33% earlier), the relative proportion, among those with knowledge of the Plan, is somewhat lower (see following table).

On the other hand, while relative awareness of Eisenhower's authorship of the Plan may be somewhat lower today, this fact is balanced by the finding that awareness that the U.S. is the source of the Plan appears slightly higher.

"And can you tell me who suggested this plan for mutual aerial inspection?" (Asked only of those having heard of Plan)

	<u>Feb 1956</u>		<u>July 1957</u>	
	(1801)		(1907)	
Eisenhower	11%	34%	10%	26%
Other U.S. Figures	6	18	11	30
Other Western Figures	1	3	2	5
Russia	1	3	4	10
Other answers	1	3	*	1
No opinion	<u>13</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>30</u>
	33% = 100%		38%@ = 102%@	

Regardless of who gets credit for proposing the Plan, it is particularly heartening that understanding of the Plan among those who have heard about it, has increased since its announcement. Whereas 19% of the total sample (or 58% of those who had heard of the Plan) had some understanding of its features in February 1956, the percentage of the general population with an understanding is now found to be 31% (or 84% among those who had heard of it).

"Would you please tell me what this plan is about - what aims it pursues?" (Asked only of those having heard of Plan)

SUMMARY TABLE

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
<u>Some understanding of aims</u>	19%	31%
Mutual Armament Control	6%	12%
Mutual Control (general)	6	7
Prevention of war and promotion of general security	5	6
Control of Atomic Weapons	1	2
Support of Disarmament Program	1	4
<u>No understanding of aims</u>	2	1
To further the security of international air traffic	*	*
Other answers	2	1
No opinion/No answer	<u>13</u>	<u>7</u>
	34%@	39%@

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

@ Some respondents gave more than one answer.

AMONG THOSE HAVING HEARD OF THE PLAN, ABOUT TWO OUT OF THREE KNEW IT HAD BEEN PROPOSED AGAIN AT LONDON, BUT ONLY ABOUT ONE OUT OF THREE THOUGHT U.S. HAD RAISED IT ...

Recent developments concerning Mutual Inspection are apparently no better known than the subject as a whole. Even among those who said that they had heard of the Plan, no better than two out of three (21% of the 37%) knew that it had been raised again at the London Disarmament talks. A further question put to those who knew that fact revealed that a bare half of that small group, or 11% of the total sample, said that it was the United States that did so.

"Do you perhaps also know where and on what occasion this plan for mutual aerial inspection and control of military installations was recently proposed again?"
(Asked only of those having heard of Plan)

	July 1957
	(1907)
Yes	21%
No	16
	37%

"And by whom or by which country was it proposed again?"

United States	11%
Other Western Country	2
Russia	4
No opinion	5
	22% [@]

[@] Some respondents gave more than one answer.

NEWSPAPERS AND RADIO SELECTED AS SOURCES THROUGH WHICH KNOWLEDGE RECEIVED -
PAMPHLETS (UTILIZED BY USIS) HARDLY MENTIONED ...

When those respondents who said that they had heard of the Mutual Inspection Plan were asked to select from a list of information sources and media those through which they might have learned about the Plan during the past year, the overwhelming majority either selected newspapers (31% of the sample), or radio (28%). That channel which USIS had directly utilized to bring this to the attention of the German public, pamphlets, received less than one-half of one per cent of the mentions.

"Here is a list of information sources and media through which you might have learned about the Aerial Inspection Plan during the past year. Will you please check those media through which you distinctly remember learning something about the Plan?" (Asked only of those having heard of Plan)

	<u>July 1957</u>
Newspapers	31%
Magazines	4
Books	*
Radio	28
Television	3
Movies	1
Pamphlets	*
Lectures	1
Posters	*
Exhibits	*
Some other, which? ...	1
Cannot remember	2
	<u>71%[@]</u>

"Now which of the media listed above would you say has taught you the most about the Aerial Inspection Plan?"
(Asked only of those mentioning media)

Newspapers	23%
Magazines	1
Books	-
Radio	10
Television	1
Movies	-
Pamphlets	*
Lectures	*
Posters	-
Exhibits	*
Some other, which? ...	*
Cannot remember	*
	<u>35%</u>

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

@ Some respondents gave more than one answer.

ORGANIZATIONS NOT GENERALLY SELECTED AS SOURCE OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE PLAN ...

While most of the informed people selected one or more of the possible sources listed in the preceding question as the means through which they heard of the Mutual Inspection Plan, when they were presented with a list of organizations through which they might have heard about it, the great majority (34% of the 37%) either answered that none were sources of information or that they could not remember if any played a role.

"Here is a list of organizations which have, during the past year, put on programs about the Mutual Aerial Inspection Plan. Will you please go over the list and check all those you can distinctly remember going to in order to hear or to see a program about Mutual Aerial Inspection." (Asked only of those having heard of Plan)

	<u>July 1957</u>
Volkshochschule (Adult education center)	*%
Labor unions	2
Amerika-Haeuser	*
Political Party meetings	1
Die Bruecke	*
Schools and Universities	1
Institut Francais	-
Some other, which? ...	*
None	4
No opinion	<u>30</u>
	38% [@]

"And through which one of these organizations would you say you have learned the most about the plan?" (Asked only of those having named an organization)

Volkshochschule (Adult education center)	*%
Labor unions	2
Amerika-Haeuser	*
Political Party meetings	1
Die Bruecke	*
Schools and Universities	1
Institut Francais	*
Some other, which? ...	*
None	-
No opinion	<u>*</u>
	4%

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

[@] Some respondents gave more than one answer.

II. Evaluation of the Plan

Section 1 - Approval of the Plan

CONSIDERABLE INCREASE IN APPROVAL ...

Whereas a bare majority (52%) of all respondents approved of the Plan in February 1956, more than four out of five (81%) approved of the Plan in July 1957. This shift in opinion came, not from those who disapproved, but from that formerly large group which had "no opinion" on the issue.

"Considering everything, do you approve of this aerial inspection plan, or don't you approve of it?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
Yes, approve of it	52%	81%
No, don't approve of it	7	8
No opinion	<u>41</u>	<u>11</u>
	100%	100%

Gratifying as these new results may be, in view of the fact that no more people seem to be aware of the Mutual Inspection Plan than was the case over a year ago, it raises the question as to why there should be this greater approval today. Since, averaged into the figures shown above are the answers of those who originally had heard of the Plan and those who had to be informed by the interviewers, a first step in further analysis, dictated a division of the responses according to whether or not they had originally known of the Plan. The four columns of figures shown below are the results of this separation.

Those individuals who had already known of the Mutual Inspection Plan (in July 1957) were almost unanimously in favor of it (92%), while three-quarters of those who had to be told (75%) were also found to approve of the Plan. Greater approval of the Plan was also found to be the case in the preceding survey among "knowledgable" people (74%) as against those who had not known (41%). The interesting point here is that today, the level of approval among those who had

not known of the Plan is as high as was the case a year ago among those who had.

"Considering everything, do you approve of this aerial inspection plan, or don't you approve of it?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>		<u>July 1957</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Yes, approve of it	74%	41%	92%	75%
No, don't approve of it	10	5	6	9
No opinion	16	54	2	16
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Section 2 - Expectations Regarding the Plan

PLAN NOW GIVEN 50-50 CHANCE ...

Not only do the West Germans now give the Plan their greater approval, but they appear to give the Plan a 50-50 chance of being accepted by Russia and the United States. Formerly, there was considerably more skepticism concerning the likelihood of the Plan's being agreed to. In 1956, three times as many people thought that it was unlikely that an agreement would be reached on the plan as thought that an agreement was likely (39% versus but 12%). The current results show that just as many people think that an agreement will be reached as think the opposite (34% and 35% respectively).

"Do you consider it likely or unlikely that the two powers - America and Russia - will reach an agreement on this plan?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
Likely	12%	34%
Unlikely	39	35
Qualified Answer	1	1
No opinion	48	30
	100%	100%

The further division of the results into the replies of those who already knew about the plan and those who did not (first shown in the preceding section) was also made for this question. The results are startlingly similar. Namely,

the optimism shown by those who had not known about the Plan in July 1957 is greater than that shown by those who had known in February 1956.

The considerable difference in opinion that has come about in the period under study is further seen in the change in attitude of those groups which, in the two studies, already knew about the Plan. Even those who knew about the Plan in February 1956 leaned strongly to the belief that it was unlikely that agreement would be reached - 59% holding it unlikely and only 18% thinking it likely. By July 1957, however, the knowledgable group considered it a slightly better than even possibility that agreement would be reached - 48% saying that an agreement was likely while 39% thinking it unlikely.

"Do you consider it likely or unlikely that the two powers - America and Russia - will reach an agreement on this plan?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>		<u>July 1957</u>	
	Know	Don't Know	Know	Don't Know
Likely	18%	9%	48%	25%
Unlikely	59	29	39	33
Qualified Answer	2	1	1	1
No opinion	21	61	12	41
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

INCLINATION TO BLAME RUSSIA AS STRONG AS EVER IF PLAN NOT REALIZED ...

Those individuals who felt that it was unlikely that Russia and the U.S. would reach an agreement on the Plan were asked which country would be more to blame should this happen. As in the past survey, approximately two-thirds of these un-optimistic people would tend to put the blame squarely on Russia, although a small group still feels that both would be equally to blame.

"In your opinion, which country would be more to blame if this Plan would not be realized - America or Russia?"
(Asked only of those saying "unlikely")

	<u>Feb 1956</u>		<u>July 1957</u>	
America	1%	3%	1%	3%
Russia	26	66	25	71
Both equally to blame	8	20	6	17
No opinion	4	11	3	9
	<u>39% = 100%</u>		<u>35% = 100%</u>	

The reasons advanced for blaming Russia should the Plan not be realized are essentially the same as those found in the previous study: namely, a belief that Russian stubbornness will block the Plan's adoption either through sheer obstructionism or distrust of the West. Detailed comments made in reply to this follow-up question will be found in the Appendix to this report.

Section 3 - Implementation

The questions examined in this section of the report are concerned with what might be the consequences of implementation of the Plan - with the implied or supplied hypothesis that an actual agreement between the powers would be reached.

AGAIN, MORE WORLD ADVANTAGES THAN SPECIFIC BENEFITS FOR GERMANY SEEN - ALTHOUGH BOTH ARE UP ...

In the preceding survey a little over a third of the respondents (36%) could see advantages which would accrue (for the world) from the implementation of the Plan, while only a little over a quarter (28%) could see benefits accruing specifically for Germany. The relationship between these two areas is still the same, although the number of people able to name benefits (for the world) or advantages specifically benefitting Germany has gone up.

Now, over half of the population (54%) can name advantages which would result from implementation of the Plan, and somewhat under half (43%) can name advantages that would benefit Germany.

"In your opinion, what advantages would result from the implementation of the plan?"

"And what advantages would accrue for Germany?"

	<u>General Advantages</u>		<u>Advantages for Germany</u>	
	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
Advantages	36%	54%	28%	43%
No advantages	18	15	22	20
No opinion	46	31	50	37
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

BANKING OF WAR FIRES STILL SEEN AS MAIN ADVANTAGE ...

The leading advantage previously mentioned as a result of implementation has further solidified its preeminent position. "Decreasing the danger of war" mentioned by 12% (in February 1956) is now brought forth by 21%, while such other factors as "armaments could not be kept secret" and "nations would come to trust and understand each other" showed smaller gains (in keeping with the greater understanding of the goals of the Plan).

"In your opinion, what advantages would result from the implementation of this plan?"

SUMMARY TABLE⁺

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
<u>ADVANTAGES</u>	38%	56%
<u>Advantages which serve peace</u>	30%	48%
The danger of war would not be so great	12%	21%
Armament could not be kept a secret	5	9
The nations would come to trust and understand each other	5	7
A surprise attack would be impossible	4	4
An armament race would be out of the question	4	7
<u>Other advantages</u>	8	8
It would be an effective mutual control (general)	6	6
Other answers	2	2
<u>NO ADVANTAGES</u>	18	15
No opinion/No answer	<u>46</u> 102% [@]	<u>31</u> 102% [@]

⁺ For specific comments, see Appendix to this report.

[@] Some respondents gave more than one answer.

GERMANY'S MAIN ADVANTAGE ALSO SEEN AS DECREASED DANGER OF WAR ...

While a majority of the West German population still is unable to name any specific benefit that would accrue to Germany from the implementation of the Mutual Inspection Plan - 20% saw no advantages and an additional 37% could not give an answer to the question - the leading advantage which is foreseen is still the expectation that the decreased danger of war would be of value to Germany (25% now as against 20% saying this during the 1956 survey).

"And what advantages would accrue for Germany?"

SUMMARY TABLE⁺

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
<u>ADVANTAGES</u>	29%	45%
<u>Advantages which serve peace</u>	24%	32%
Germany's chances for peace would be greater - danger of war decreases	20%	25%
A surprise attack would not be possible	2	4
Political tensions in the world would lessen	2	3
<u>Other advantages</u>	5	13
German armament could be reduced)	-	5
German economy could be stimulated)	-	-
Reunification would be more likely	1	4
Germany would get more information concerning other nations	1	1
Germany would be accepted as equal	-	1
Other answers	3	2
<u>NO ADVANTAGES</u>	22	20
No opinion/No answer	<u>50</u> 101% [@]	<u>37</u> 102% [@]

⁺ For specific comments, see Appendix to this report.

[@] Some respondents gave more than one answer.

ADVANTAGES NOW SEEN OUTWEIGHING DISADVANTAGES BY ALMOST 3 TO 1 ...

The point was made in the previous report that there were signs which indicated that if more information concerning the Plan could be given, more approval of its objectives would be noted. In the current report, while there is little if any increased knowledge about the Plan among the population, those who know about it seem to exhibit a deeper understanding of its goals.

The emergence of this factor can also be seen in the following figures showing the percentage of people who were able to name advantages and disadvantages which would result from the implementation of the Plan. Actually, these were two separate questions. The summary table below calls attention to the fact that the percentage of people able to cite advantages which would arise is almost three times as great as the percentage able to cite disadvantages (54% versus 19%). In the 1956 survey the ratio was 2 to 1 (36% citing advantages while 16% named disadvantages).

"In your opinion, what advantages would result from the implementation of this Plan?"

"And can you name any disadvantages which would, in your opinion, result from this plan?"

	<u>Advantages</u>		<u>Disadvantages</u>	
	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
Can name advantages or disadvantages	36%	54%	16%	19%
Firm opinion that there will				
- be <u>no</u> advantages	18	15		-
- be <u>no</u> disadvantages		-	34	35
No opinion	<u>46</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>46</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%

OPINION STILL DIVIDED AS TO WHO WOULD DERIVE GREATER ADVANTAGES ...

Since the American proposal for mutual inspection is presented as an honest effort to assure all concerned that the Plan works equally to the benefit of both East and West, it is essential that public opinion assess it in that light. The results show that much work remains to be done to spread and foster this opinion. A minority of the population (38%) sees the Plan as equally advantageous to both East and West. This figure is much the same as it was a year and a half ago - when it was 30%.

While the percentages of people saying that the Plan works out to the benefit of either the East or the West is again practically equal (13% and 15%, as against 11% for each in February 1956), such answers can be taken as indications of failure to see the Plan in the light intended; for such replies indicate a belief that the Plan would enable one side or the other to gain some sort of advantage over the other - a belief that would preclude its being agreed to by both sides.

"Which of the two sides, East or West, would derive greater advantages from the implementation of the Plan?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
East	11%	15%
West	11	13
Both the same	30	38
No opinion	<u>48</u>	<u>34</u>
	100%	100%

Even when the answers to this question are further divided according to whether the respondent already knew about the Plan or had to be informed of its essence before giving his opinion, we find that less than half (45%) of the "knowledgable people" indicated their belief that the Plan would be advantageous to both East and West.

"Which of the two sides, East or West, would derive greater advantages from the implementation of this plan?"

	<u>July 1957</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
East		
East	24%	10%
West	20	10
Both the same	45	33
No opinion	<u>11</u>	<u>47</u>
	100%	100%

INCREASED CONFIDENCE THAT INSPECTION WILL BE CARRIED OUT AS PLANNED ...

There is considerably more confidence today that the Mutual Aerial Inspection will be carried out as planned than there was in early 1956. At that time fewer than one person out of five (18%) would say that they were "fairly" or "very confident" that this would happen. The present survey shows that more than one out of three (35%) now have that degree of confidence.

Another point to be noticed is that although the percentage of people with "no opinion" is now much less than before (25% as against 41%) the proportion of people showing their pessimism by replying that they felt "little" or "not at all confident", has remained the same - namely, four out of ten.

"Supposing Russia and America would reach an agreement on this plan: How confident are you that mutual aerial inspection will actually be carried out as planned: Are you very confident, fairly confident, only little confident, or not at all?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
Very confident	3%	8%
Fairly confident	15	27
Little confident	26	29
Not at all confident	15	11
No opinion	41	25
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

The increased confidence found among the general population is not confined to those individuals who had knowledge concerning the Plan. While it is true that those who already knew about the Plan had a much higher level of confidence, it can be seen that an increase in confidence has occurred among those who knew as well as among those who had to be informed.

The percentage with a relatively high level of confidence just about doubled in both groups. Among those who had to be informed it went from 13% to 25%; while among those with knowledge it went from 29% to 54%. Indeed, the aura of increased confidence is perhaps nowhere better exemplified than in the similarity of the percentages of those who had not known about the Plan in July 1957 with

those who had known in February 1956.

"Supposing Russia and America would reach an agreement on this plan: How confident are you that mutual aerial inspection will actually be carried out as planned: Are you very confident, fairly confident, only little confident, or not at all?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>		<u>July 1957</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Very confident	6%	2%	13%	5%
Fairly confident	23	11	38	20
Little confident	38	19	35	27
Not at all confident	17	14	9	11
No opinion	16	54	5	37
	100%	100%	100%	100%

MAJORITY NOW HOLDS THAT PURPOSE OF PLAN WILL BE ACHIEVED IF IMPLEMENTED ...

The percentage of the West German population believing that the purpose of the Plan, namely increased military security, will be realized by America and Russia if the Plan is implemented has increased from a plurality (39%) to a majority of all respondents (57%). The size of the skeptical minority believing that there will be no increase in security has remained exactly static - 14%.

"Supposing this plan is implemented by both sides - America and Russia - do you think that the purpose of the plan will then be achieved or, to put it differently, will both sides then enjoy increased military security, or won't they?"

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
Increased security	39%	57%
No increased security	14	14
No opinion	47	29
	100%	100%

Optimism has advanced to such a state that even among those individuals who had not heard of the Mutual Inspection Plan, one out of two (49%) felt that it would give increased security. In this same group, only one person out of ten thought that there would be no increase in security (11%).

	<u>Feb 1956</u>		<u>July 1957</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Increased security	57%	30%	71%	49%
No increased security	20	10	19	11
No opinion	23	60	10	40
	100%	100%	100%	100%

MAJORITY NOW FOUND TO FEEL THAT PLAN WOULD CONTRIBUTE SOMETHING TO WORLD PEACE ...

A year and a half ago when the preceding survey took place, one person out of three (36%) could be found to say that realization of the Plan would contribute something towards world peace. The three categories combined to secure this total included those agreeing that it would contribute "to a very high degree", "to a high degree", or "to a certain degree". While it is not argued that a response of "to a certain degree" connotes wild enthusiasm, it can be maintained that in view of the alternatives offered, the respondent means thereby that it at least contributes to a measurable, i.e. not insignificant, degree - and hence should be considered a minimal favorable response.

Utilizing the same divisions, it is apparent that over half (58%) now have this same degree of favorable outlook.

"To what degree, in your opinion, would the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?" (CARD)

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
To a very high degree	8%)	12%)
To a high degree	13) 36	22) 56
To a certain degree	15)	22)
To a small degree	7	8
Hardly or not at all	10	7
No opinion	<u>47</u>	<u>29</u>
	100%	100%

The further divisions of these data into separate tabulations based upon those who knew and those who had to be told, before their opinions could be solicited, shows for the first time that the attitude of those who in July 1957 had to be told was not quite as favorable thereafter as was found to be the case for those who in February 1956 already knew.

The percentage of those evincing belief in the Plan's contribution to world peace among those who had to be told about it in July 1957 was 44%, which, while much higher than for the same type of person in the preceding February (25%),

is not as high as the 56% recorded by the knowledgeable people at the earlier time.

"To what degree, in your opinion, would the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?" (CARD)

	<u>Feb 1956</u>		<u>July 1957</u>	
	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
To a very high degree	14%)	5%)	19%)	8%)
To a high degree	18)56	10)25	27)76	19)44
To a certain degree	24)	10)	30)	17)
To a small degree	12	5	11	6
Hardly or not at all	15	8	7	7
No opinion	17	62	6	43
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

ENHANCED CHANCES FOR PEACE CITED BY THOSE WITH HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE ...

Those people who answered "to a high" or "to a very high" degree in response to the question as to what degree they felt that realization of the Plan would contribute towards world peace were asked what made them think so. Their answer", summarized in the following table, show that there is a slightly greater tendency for them to emphasize the increased chances for maintaining peace. This is again a further reflection of the previous indications that there is now somewhat greater understanding of the Plan's goals among those who have heard of it.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a very high degree" or "To a high degree":
 "What makes you think so?"

SUMMARY TABLE⁺

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
<u>Chances for maintaining peace would be enhanced</u>	15%	26%
Mutual control would mean the end of military secrets	6%	11%
The danger of war would be reduced	6	9
Armament would be curtailed	2	3
Surprise attacks would be prevented	1	3
<u>General understanding between East and West would be promoted</u>	4	5
A rapprochement and cooperation between the two parties would be promoted	4	5
Other answers	1	2
No opinion/No answer	<u>1</u> 21%	<u>2</u> 35% [@]

⁺ For specific comments, see Appendix to this report.

[@] Some respondents gave more than one answer.

REASONS CITED BY THOSE WITH LESS THAN HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE IN PLAN'S CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS PEACE MUCH THE SAME AS IN PREVIOUS SURVEY ...

The following summary tables give in condensed form the reasons given by those persons who answered that they felt that the Plan would contribute "to a certain degree" or even "to a small degree" or "hardly or not at all" towards preserving world peace. The patterns of response are almost exactly those found being given by people who gave these answers in the previous survey.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a certain degree":

"What makes you think so?"

SUMMARY TABLE⁺

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
<u>Chances for maintaining peace would be enhanced</u>	7%	7%
Through mutual control armament could be limited	4%	3%
The danger of war would be reduced	2	3
Surprise attacks would be prevented	1	1
<u>General understanding between East and West would be promoted</u>	2	1
A rapprochement between the two sides could be achieved	2	1
<u>Implementation of the plan does not guarantee the maintenance of peace</u>	5	9
There is no guarantee that both parties will stick to the plan	2	5
Implementation of this plan is not an essential factor in preventing war	2	2
The plan might be successful provided both parties keep the agreement which they would conclude	1	-
The East cannot be relied on to comply with an agreement	*	2
<u>An understanding between East and West would not be promoted</u>	-	1
Contrasts remain and forstall full agreement	-	1
<u>Other answers</u>	*	2
<u>No opinion/No answer</u>	1	2
	<u>15%</u>	<u>22%</u>

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

⁺ For specific comments, see Appendix to this report.

"To what degree would, in your opinion, the realization of this plan contribute towards preserving world peace?"

IF "To a small degree" or "Hardly or not at all":
"What makes you think so?"

SUMMARY TABLE+

	<u>Feb 1956</u>	<u>July 1957</u>
<u>Implementation of the plan does not guarantee the maintenance of peace</u>	13%	12%
This plan will have no influence on war or peace	6%	4%
Both parties could be counted on to sabotage a treaty by secretly going ahead with rearmament	5	6
Russia cannot be expected to stick to the plan	2	2
<u>General understanding between East and West would not be promoted</u>	1	1
Existing tensions would not be eased through this plan	1	*
It would only result in espionage activities on both sides	*	*
The U.S. and Russia will never reach an agreement	*	1
<u>Other answers</u>	1	1
<u>No opinion/No answer</u>	<u>2</u> 17%	<u>1</u> 15%

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

+ For specific comments, see Appendix to this report.

III - Views Regarding International Disarmament

ONE THIRD WOULD PUT OFF REUNIFICATION FOR DISARMAMENT

In the question under consideration here the attempt was made to link the issues of disarmament and reunification. On each of these issues as separate factors a healthy majority could be expected to be favorable. However, since in the world of reality these two are closely bound up as far as the German problem is concerned, the following alternatives were posed for selection by the West German public:

- A - A choice favoring disarmament, wherein reunification would be put off
- B - A choice for disarmament, only on condition that it brings reunification, and
- C - A stand against disarmament, regardless of its influence on reunification.

The answers obtained to this question open up many avenues for speculation. For example, about one-third (32%) selected answer "A" indicating that they favor disarmament even if it meant that reunification would not be reached as fast. While this can be interpreted as showing how great an interest they have in a general disarmament, it has a reverse twist in that one may wonder as to how great their real interest is in reunification.

A majority (51%) actually chose answer "B", which said that they were for disarmament, but only if reunification could be reached through it. Such a view may be likened to those who would eat their cake and have it too. They certainly cannot be considered to have a burning interest in accomplishing general disarmament when such a big "if" is attached.

Taking the sum total of responses to this two-edged question, one must come to the conclusion that there is evidence that neither issue is a burning one - at least when opposed to the other - for only 1/3 are unqualifiedly for disarmament, while only 1/2 choose answers indicating an interest in reunification.

"Which of the views stated on this card regarding a general international disarmament comes closest to your own?" (CARD)

A - I am all for general disarmament even if this means reunification would not be reached as fast.	32%
B - I am for general disarmament, but only if reunification can be reached through it.	51
C - I'm against any form of general disarmament, regardless of whether it's a means of achieving reunification or not.	5
No opinion	12
	<hr/> 100%

LEVEL OF RUSSIAN INTEREST IN DISARMAMENT JUDGED TO BE AS LOW AS EVER --
LEVEL OF U.S. INTEREST JUDGED MUCH HIGHER

In May 1956 two questions were presented to the West German population concerning the amount of interest they felt that Russia and the United States had in the subject of a general disarmament.

A cynical majority replied that both Russia and the United States had slight or no interest whatever in disarmament, while equally small minorities thought that they had an interest. The consensus of opinion concerning the U.S. and Russia was uniform - and unfavorable.

The picture today shows a startling change. Not as far as Russia is concerned however. The pattern of responses concerning that country's interest in disarmament is pretty much the same as it was before.

"How great, do you think, is the actual Russian interest in a general international disarmament: Very great, great or slight?"

	May 1956 (1843)	July 1957 (1907)
Very great	4%)	5%)
Great	13) 17%	16) 21%
Slight	42	43
No interest whatever (volunteered)	16	15
No opinion	25	21
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%

The big change is found in the responses concerning the level of interest they feel that the U.S. has in a general disarmament. If the West Germans cynically lumped the U.S. and Russia together on this subject before, they see a vast difference now. They have not exactly completely reversed their previous feelings. Still, a slight plurality can now be found saying that the U.S. has "great" or "very great" interest. This percentage (44%) is more than twice as great as was found a year ago (18%)... before the Suez and Hungarian events.

"How great, do you think, is the actual American interest in a general international disarmament: Very great, great or slight?

	May 1956 (1843)	July 1957 (1907)
Very great	4%)	10%)
Great	14) 18%	34) 44%
Slight	42	29
No interest whatever (volunteered)	13	6
No opinion	<u>27</u>	<u>21</u>
	100%	100%

ONLY AMONG THOSE WHO KNOW OF MUTUAL INSPECTION PLAN IS MAJORITY FOUND SAYING U.S. INTEREST IN DISARMAMENT IS HIGH

While the difference between the figures cited above (concerning U.S. interest in disarmament) can be linked to the important series of intervening events, still another factor can be experimentally introduced - the Mutual Inspection Plan. By sorting out the answers of those individuals who had known of the Plan, as distinguished from those who had not known, on this question of U.S. interest in disarmament, a new cross-tabulation is obtained.

It is among those who knew of the Plan before being interviewed that the greatest changes had occurred. Among them a clear majority (56%) answered that the U.S. interest was "great" or "very great". It must be pointed out, however, that even among those with knowledge of the Plan somewhat over a third (actually 37%, as against 34% among those who had not known) still maintained that American interest in a general disarmament was slight or non-existent.

"How great, do you think, is the actual American interest in a general international disarmament: Very great, great or slight?"

	<u>Know</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
Very great	14%)	7%)
Great	42) 56%	30) 37%
Slight	31)	28)
No interest whatever) 37) 34
(volunteered)	6)	6)
No opinion	7	29
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

The effect of intervening time is also apparent even among those who had not known of the Plan, for the percentage saying that the U.S. interest is high is slightly larger (37%) than the percentage feeling that U.S. interest was low (34%).

IV - The Role of Information Media

As a follow-up study to the one carried out last February, it was an essential part of the design to ascertain the role that the various information media, and particularly USIS media played in the spreading of information concerning the Mutual Inspection Plan. Since it became apparent in the first part of this report that the number of people knowing about the Plan has not materially increased in the last year and a half, there is no problem of determining which USIS activity was most responsible. Instead, we are faced with the question of whether USIS activities played any role in keeping knowledge of the Mutual Inspection Plan before the West German public.

The first step in the process, therefore, is to determine the relationship between the types of media exposure and knowledge of the Plan; and finally to determine whether people exposed to USIS activities have any more or less knowledge than those who have not been similarly influenced.

Section 1 - Non-USIS Media Exposure and Knowledge of the Plan

DAILY RADIO LISTENERS SOMEWHAT MORE KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE PLAN THAN OTHERS

Inasmuch as 93% of the West German public listens to the radio it was advisable to make several divisions of "radio listeners", and then to determine each group's level of knowledge concerning the Mutual Inspection Plan. Those who listen to the radio every day at least one or more times were found to know more than those who listen less often, or who do not listen at all (43% versus 29%, 22%, and 15% has knowledge).

Frequency of Radio Listening

	At least every day (1300)	Several times a week (346)	Once a week or less (121)	Don't listen (138)
Had heard of Plan	43%	29%	22%	15%
Had not heard	<u>57</u> 100%	<u>71</u> 100%	<u>78</u> 100%	<u>85</u> 100%

NEWSPAPER READERS KNOW MORE THAN NON-READERS ABOUT PLAN - SAME TRUE FOR MAGAZINE READERS

A similar analysis was made of newspaper readers, with divisions made between those who read a paper more than once a week, those who read papers but do it once a week or less often, and those who admit that they do not read them at all. The percentage in each group found to have answered that they had knowledge of the Mutual Inspection Plan is completely parallel to that found for radio listeners. The range of knowledge goes from a high of 41% to a low of 12% among the non-readers.

Frequency of Newspaper Reading

	<u>More than once a week</u> (1618)	<u>Once a week or less</u> (48)	<u>Don't read</u> (241)
Had heard of Plan	41%	25%	12%
Had not heard	<u>59</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>88</u>
	100%	100%	100%

German magazine readers were simply divided into readers and non-readers, since the division between the two groups is more even (52% of the sample read magazines). The result of the cross-run shows that as with radio and with newspapers, magazine readers are slightly more knowledgeable about the Plan than are non-readers (46% versus 28% with knowledge).

Readership of Magazines

	<u>Readers</u> (988)	<u>Non-readers</u> (119)
Had heard of Plan	46%	28%
Had not heard	<u>54</u>	<u>72</u>
	100%	100%

TELEVISION VIEWERS ALSO SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY TO KNOW OF PLAN

The same general pattern which has been found for newspaper readers versus non-readers, and for magazine readers versus non-readers also holds true for those individuals who have seen a television program during the year. Some 46% of such viewers were found to know about the Plan as compared with only 29% of the non-viewers.

Television Viewing

	<u>Have seen TV</u> (934)	<u>Have not</u> (974)
Had heard of Plan	46%	29%
Had not heard	54	71
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

In this connection, it must be pointed out, that although almost half of the West German population (49%) has seen some television during the year, most such people are very infrequent viewers. Three out of five viewers do so less often than once a month.

"Have you perhaps seen any television programs during the past year?"

Yes (Approximately how often?)		49%
Every day	4%	
2 - 6 times a week	3	
Once a week or several times a month	12	
Less than once a month	30	
No opinion	*	
No		<u>51</u> 100%

A further probe of those who saw any programs to determine whether they remembered seeing one dealing with the Mutual Inspection Plan, revealed that only one out of ten in this group thought that he had (5% of the total)-although 2% (of the 5%) was vague as to where or when.

* Less than one half of one per cent.

"Have you perhaps seen any television programs during the past year?"

IF "Yes":

"Has one of these programs perhaps ever dealt with the plan of instituting mutual aerial inspection or establishing a thinned-out military zone?"

Yes	5%
(Which television station was it?)	
NWRV (Hamburg and Cologne)	2%
Munich TV	*
Baden-Baden TV (South/West)	*
Other TV stations	1
No opinion/No answer	2
(And approximately when did you see it?)	
1 - 2 weeks ago	*%
3 - 4 weeks ago	1
5 weeks and more ago	2
Don't know	2
No	43
No opinion	1
	<hr/> 49%

READERS OF AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS TWICE AS LIKELY TO KNOW ABOUT THE PLAN AS NON-READERS

Those Germans who read American newspapers or magazines to any extent were found to have a considerably greater awareness of the Plan than non-readers. Seven out of ten of the reading group (70%) as against only half as many (35%) among the non-readers were found to have knowledge of the Plan.

Readership of American Newspapers or Magazines

	Readers (107)	Non-readers (1800)
Had heard of Plan	70%	35%
Had not heard	<u>30</u>	<u>65</u>
	100%	100%

* Less than one half of one per cent.

Unfortunately, the numerical size of the readers of American newspapers or magazines is not very large. Only a maximum of 5% can be included as readers when the loosest possible definition is used.

"Have you perhaps occasionally read any American newspapers, pictorials or periodicals during the past year?"

	<u>April 1955</u> (1269)	<u>May 1956</u> (1843)	<u>July 1957</u> (1907)
Yes - Often	1%)	1%)	1%)
Occasionally	5) 10%	3) 7%	2) 5%
Seldom	4)	3)	2)
No	<u>90</u> 100%	<u>93</u> 100%	<u>95</u> 100%

Section 2 - USIS Media Exposure and Knowledge of the Plan

MAJORITY OF VOA LISTENERS KNOW OF PLAN

When division of the sample is made into VOA listeners and non-listeners, the resulting table shows that a majority of the VOA listeners (55%) but only three-tenths (30%) of the non-listeners had knowledge of the Plan.

Listening to VOA

	<u>Listeners</u> (553)	<u>Non-listeners</u> (1354)
Had heard of Plan	55%	30%
Had not heard	<u>45</u> 100%	<u>70</u> 100%

Only two out of seven persons who listen to the VOA can remember hearing anything about the Mutual Inspection Plan through these programs (i.e. 8% out of the 29% who listen to the VOA). While 8% of the West German population equals a sizeable number of people, it cannot be considered an outstanding index of VOA effectiveness in spreading knowledge of the Plan.

"Did you ever hear anything about the Mutual Aerial Inspection Plan or the so-called 'thinned-out' zone in this program?"
(Asked of those listening to VOA.)

Yes, several times	3%
Yes, once	5
No, never	20
No opinion	<u>1</u>
	29%

CLOSE TO THREE-FOURTHS OF FILM, AMERIKA HAUS, AND EXTENSION PROGRAM ATTENDEES
HAD HEARD OF MUTUAL INSPECTION

After dividing the population into those who had attended USIS film showings, visited Amerika Hauser, or attended an extension program (as against those who had not) the percentages found to have already known of the Mutual Inspection Plan prior to the survey were the highest yet - ranging from 72% to 74%.

USIS Film Program@

	<u>Have seen Films</u> (97)	<u>Have not seen Films</u> (1774)
Had heard of Plan	74%	35%
Had not heard	<u>26</u> 100%	<u>65</u> 100%

Attendance at Amerika Haus

	<u>Are visiting</u> (46)	<u>Visited in past</u> (88)	<u>Never visited</u> (1773)
Had heard of Plan	72%	71%	35%
Had not heard	<u>28</u> 100%	<u>29</u> 100%	<u>65</u> 100%

Amerika Haus Extension Program#

	<u>Attended</u> (22)	<u>Did not attend</u> (1834)
Had heard of Plan	73%	37%
Had not heard	<u>27</u> 100%	<u>63</u> 100%

@ Excludes 36 people who were uncertain whether or not they had seen USIS films.
Excludes 51 people who were uncertain whether or not they had attended an extension program.

CAUTIONS TO BE NOTED

Although the percentages of people with knowledge are about twice as large for those taking part in a USIS activity as for those individuals who have not taken part, too much should not be read into these seemingly favorable results.

For example:

1. Among those people who had attended a USIS film showing, 72% were found to know about the Mutual Inspection Plan, while among those who had not seen a picture only 35% knew of it. Off-hand the temptation is strong to say that USIS film showings had a decided influence on its viewers. However, since all who said that they attended such showings were asked to tell the subject matter of the films which they saw, there is a further check available. Not a single one of the attendees mentioned the Mutual Inspection Plan! Thus while there can be no doubt that USIS film attendees know more about the Mutual Inspection Plan, they did not get that information from the films themselves!

2. While those people who have visited an Amerika Haus more than once were twice as likely to have heard of the Plan as was found among those who never had, the fact that those who had once (sometime in the past) visited an Amerika Haus were just as likely to know about it (71%) does not permit the claim that such heightened knowledge was due to the information obtained through visiting the Haus.

Furthermore, as was done with VOA listeners, those who said that they had visited an Amerika Haus more than once during the year were asked if they had ever heard, read or seen anything about the Plan in the Amerika Haus. The percentage answering "yes" is quite small. It amounts to less than one half of one percent of the total population, and when recalculated upon the base of those who had visited the Amerika Haus, it comes to less than one out of ten (i.e. 7% of those who attended an Amerika Haus more than once).

If visited an Amerika Haus more than once:

"Have you perhaps ever heard, read or seen anything about the Mutual Aerial Inspection Plan in the Amerika Haus?"

(1907)

Yes	*%	7%
No	2	89
No opinion	*	4
	<hr/> 2%	<hr/> 100%

* Less than one half of one per cent.

3. The table concerning the extension programs can also be misleading. Since only two of the activities carried on by the Amerika Haus Extension Program were applicable to the spread of information about the Mutual Inspection Plan, those persons who said that they had attended such an activity, were asked to say what type it was. Only if they answered that they had attended a lecture or film showing (the two possibilities through which they could have learned of the Plan) were they asked if they remembered hearing or seeing anything about it there. The resulting figures here are extremely small, and hence must be considered statistically unreliable. Still, it is interesting that not a single one of the ten souls who indicated their attendance at a lecture or film showing felt that they had heard about it through such attendance.

(It must be pointed out that only 1% of the sample indicated attendance at any kind of an extension program. Included in that figure are the ten people who mentioned lectures or films.)

Section 3 - The Relationship between USIS and non-USIS Exposure and Knowledge of the Plan

It has been eminently apparent that every time there has been an examination of a particular medium of communication that those individuals who have the greatest exposure are found to be most likely to have knowledge of the Mutual Inspection Plan. This was true in varying degrees depending upon the specific medium under scrutiny.

Inasmuch as our main interest has been in the relationship between USIS exposure and knowledge of the Plan, the "Cautions" which have had to be considered in the preceding section have called into question the data found favorable to USIS exposure. Since evidence is lacking which could prove that the greater awareness found was due solely or directly to a particular USIS activity, it was necessary to probe further into the interrelationship between exposure to USIS activities and to general media exposure as far as knowledge of the Plan is concerned.

Study of the level of knowledge about the Plan held by those who were exposed to one or more of the USIS activities as against those who were not exposed to any USIS media reveals that there is twice as much knowledge to be found in the first group (56% knew, as against 28% among the non-USIS exposed).

	<u>USIS exposed</u> (625)	<u>Non-USIS exposed</u> (1282)
Had heard of Plan	56%	28%
Had not heard	<u>44</u> 100%	<u>72</u> 100%

However, it is possible that included among our USIS exposed people are many individuals who have been exposed to several USIS media, and so have more sources than people in the second group. Even if this should not be the case, we would still have to rule out the possibility that the higher degree of knowledge is due to the fact that USIS exposed individuals have greater media exposure in general.

Since listeners to the VOA comprise the largest single group of USIS exposed people (of the 625 USIS exposed, 488 only listen to the VOA) this group was examined to test the possibilities under consideration.* (It is also worth noting that among the VOA listeners 55% were found to have knowledge of the Plan, while among non-listeners it had been 30%. These figures are almost identical with those for general USIS exposure.)

After separating those who listen to the VOA from those who do not, an index of exposure to communication media was calculated. Each respondent was assigned a score of 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0 -- where the higher the score, the greater was the exposure. The scores themselves were based upon the following considerations:

<u>Media Habit</u>	<u>Score</u>
Listen to the radio at least once a day	1
Viewed some television during the year	1
Read newspapers every day	1
Read some magazine during the year	<u>1</u>
Maximum	4

* An additional consideration was the small number of cases for other USIS activities.

Where the above habit was not found, a score of 0 was assigned. Among VOA listeners and non-listeners, two groups were compiled. Those with scores of 3 or 4 were called "high exposure", and those with 2, 1, or 0 were labeled "low exposure".

	<u>VOA listeners</u> (553)	<u>Non-listeners</u> (1354)
High exposure	66%	44%
Low exposure	<u>34</u> 100%	<u>46</u> 100%

Thus, one of the possibilities upon which we had to check is found to be true. Namely, VOA listeners, in addition to that specific factor, are also more "exposed" individuals - and with this greater degree of exposure we must expect greater knowledge.

However, we can go one step further and check up on this very finding by keeping the degree of exposure constant. When that is done the following table emerges:

	<u>VOA listeners</u>		<u>Non-listeners</u>	
	Exposure		Exposure	
	<u>High</u> (364)	<u>Low</u> (189)	<u>High</u> (593)	<u>Low</u> (761)
Had heard of Plan	62%	40%	42%	21%
Had not heard	<u>38</u> 100%	<u>60</u> 100%	<u>58</u> 100%	<u>79</u> 100%

At this point the conclusion is inescapable that although it is very true that VOA listeners (and most probably all USIS exposed individuals) have a higher level of exposure to all media of communication, it is also true that even when general exposure is held constant they are a peculiarly alert group in their own right.

The following table, which is a complete tabulation from which the preceding one was compiled, is presented to forstall any speculation that there is still some difference between the two groups which has been covered up by the lumping together of scores of 3 and 4 on the one hand and 2, 1, and 0 on the other.

	VOA listeners (553)				
	S C O R E S				
	4 (152)	3 (212)	2 (140)	1 (42)	0 (7)
Had heard of Plan	69%	57%	46%	21%	29%
Had not heard	31 100%	43 100%	54 100%	79 100%	71 100%

	Non-listeners (1354)				
	S C O R E S				
	4 (197)	3 (396)	2 (360)	1 (261)	0 (140)
Had heard of Plan	46%	41%	30%	18%	5%
Had not heard	54 100%	59 100%	70 100%	82 100%	95 100%

Section 4 - Extent of USIS Exposure

DECREASING AUDIENCE FOR USIS ACTIVITIES

VOA -

Whereas two years ago a majority (54%) of the adult West Germans still listened to the programs of the Voice of America, there remains but three out of ten (29%) who do so today.

"Have you ever listened to the program 'The Voice of America' over the radio? (Approximately how often during the past year?)"

	April 1955 (1269)	May 1956 (1843)	July 1957 (1907)
Yes, 4 - 6 times a week	9%)	4%)	3%)
Yes, 1 - 3 times a week	12)	9)	6)
Yes, 1 - 3 times a month	20) 54%	13) 39%	9) 29%
Yes, less than once a month	13)	13)	11)
Yes, I heard it in the past	13	19	20
No, have never heard it - or don't listen to radio	33	42	49
Don't know	-	-	2
	100%	100%	100%

Films -

An even sharper drop seems to have occurred among those who remember having seen any American-made cultural or documentary film. Although it was never expected to have a mass appeal, about one person out of eight (13%) in 1955 saw a USIS film through non-commercial channels. Today it is but one out of twenty (5%).

"Have you ever seen any American-made cultural or documentary films during meetings or lectures, for instance, or at adult education centers or seminars? (That is, not in connection with a regular feature film.)"

	<u>April 1955</u> (1269)	<u>May 1956</u> (1843)	<u>July 1957</u> (1907)
Yes	13%	11%	5%
No	<u>87</u> 100%	<u>89</u> 100%	<u>95</u> 100%

Amerika Haus -

The evidence concerning the trend in attendance at the Amerika Haus is not as clear-cut as is the case for the other two activities. The percentage of people attending an Amerika Haus more than once during a year has never been very large, so that the fluctuations noted in the table below cannot be taken as any more than chance fluctuations - although the July 1957 figure is the lowest of the three.

"Have you ever visited an 'Amerika Haus'? Approximately how often during the past twelve months?"

	<u>April 1955</u> (1269)	<u>May 1956</u> (1843)	<u>July 1957</u> (1907)
Yes, 12 times or more	*%)	1%)	*%)
Yes, 7 - 11 times	*)	1)	*)
Yes, 4 - 6 times	1) 3%	1) 4%	*) 2%
Yes, more than once	2)	1)	2)
Yes, once or visited a center in the past	5	5	5
No, have never visited a center	<u>92</u> 100%	<u>91</u> 100%	<u>93</u> 100%

* Less than one half of one per cent.

Amerika Haus Extension Program -

Unfortunately a question asking for possible attendance at Amerika Haus extension programs was not asked until 1956, so that there are only two time checks available. The slight drop to be seen (from 3% in 1956 to 1% in 1957) however, is in keeping with the tendency running through all tables concerning attendance at USIS activities.

"Have you ever attended an acitivity sponsored by an Amerika Haus which was held outside the center itself, perhaps even in some other vicinity?"

	<u>May 1956</u> <u>(1843)</u>	<u>July 1957</u> <u>(1907)</u>
Yes	3%	1%
No	94	96
No opinion	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
	100%	100%



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 077849211